

80



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,143	05/25/2001	Ilya Kimos	50277-1734	4448

29989 7590 03/14/2005

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

SHIN, KYUNG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/866,143

Applicant(s)

KIRNOS, ILYA

Examiner

Kyung H Shin

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 76-107 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 76-107 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/19/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers filed 5/25/2001.
2. Claims 1 - 107 are pending. Claims 34 - 75 are cancelled. Independent claims are 1, 12, 25, 31, 76, 87, 99, 105.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 - 3, 6, 9, 12 - 16, 21, 24, 25, 31 - 33, 76 - 78, 81, 84, 87 - 90, 95, 99, 105 - 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Verma et al. (US Patent No. 6,856,993).

Regarding Claims 1, 76 (Original), Verma discloses a method for managing files (see Verma col. 8, lines 54-61; col. 8, lines 20-25: file management operational system), the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2143

- a) mapping information about a file system to a comparison file, the information identifying at least a first item in the file system located at a first location, the first location being identifiable by a first location information; (see Verma col. 9, lines 10-17: file handler (i.e. comparison file or working item) for file system management operations)
- b) making a working version of a portion of the file system, the working version including at least a first working item that corresponds to the first item, the first working item initially being located at a second location identifiable by the first location information; (see Verma col. 16, lines 39-44: 1st and 2nd operational states (i.e. working item states) for same file) and
- c) using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if the first working item is located at a third location identifiable by a second location information, the second location information being different than the first location information. (see Verma col. 16, lines 39-44: 1st, 2nd and 3rd operational states (i.e. working item states) for first and second files, separate file handle (i.e. working item) for separate first and second file)

Regarding Claims 2, 77 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 1, 76, wherein if the first working item is located at the third location, the method includes causing the first item in the file system to move to a fourth location identifiable by the second location information. (see Verma col. 16, lines 39-44: 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th operational states (i.e. working item states) for same file)

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding Claims 3, 78 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 1, 76, using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if the first working item is located at a third location identifiable by a second location information includes determining if the first working item has a new name. (see Verma col. 28, lines 30-37; col. 8, lines 26-28: rename operation performed and file system update completed)

Regarding Claims 6, 81 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 1, 76, further including signaling the file system to delete the first item if the first working item is omitted from the working version. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 28, lines 14-20; col. 8, lines 26-28: delete operation performed and file system update completed)

Regarding Claims 9, 84 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 1, 76, further comprising determining if the first working item was edited subsequent to making the working version. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 8, lines 26-28: edit operation performed and file system update completed)

Regarding Claim 12 (Original), Verma discloses a method for managing files (see Verma col. 8, lines 54-61; col. 8, lines 20-25: file management operational system), the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2143

- a) mapping information about a file system to a comparison file; (see Verma col. 9, lines 10-17: file handler (i.e. comparison item) for file system management operations)
- b) making a working version of a portion of the file system; (see Verma col. 3, lines 13-19: isolation directory (i.e. working item) for file system information manipulation) and
- c) using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if a first working item in the working version was once copied from a second working item in the working version. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10; col. 8, lines 26-28: read/write (i.e. copy) operation performed and file system update completed)

Regarding Claims 13, 88 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 12, 87, further comprising causing the portion of the file system to include the first working item after determining the first working item was once copied from the second working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 8, lines 26-28: read/write (i.e. copy) operation performed and completed)

Regarding Claims 14, 89 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 12, 87, wherein the second working item originates from a first item in the portion of the file system. (see Verma col. 16, lines 39-44: 1st and 2nd operational states (i.e. working item states) for same file)

Regarding Claim 15 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claim 13,

Art Unit: 2143

wherein the second working item is created as new after the working version is made. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12: file creation (i.e. new) operation performed)

Regarding Claims 16, 90 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 13, 88, wherein a content of the first working item is different than a content of the second working item. (see Verma col. 9, lines 10-17: separate first and second file handles (i.e. first and second working items) for manipulation of two separate files)

Regarding Claims 21, 95 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 12, 89, further comprising determining if the first working item was edited after being copied from the second working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12: read/write (i.e. edit) operation performed)

Regarding Claim 24 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claim 12, wherein using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if a first working item in the working version was once copied from a second working item in the working version includes comparing a content of the first working item to a content of the second working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12: determination of edited (i.e. changed contents) file information via file handle (i.e. working item))

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding Claims 25, 99 (Original), Verma discloses a method for managing files (see Verma col. 8, lines 54-61; col. 8, lines 20-25: file management operational system), the method comprising:

- a) mapping information about a file system to a comparison file, the information identifying at least a first item in the file system located at a first location, the first location being identifiable by a first location information; (see Verma col. 9, lines 10-17: file handler (i.e. comparison item) for file system management operations)
- b) making a working version of a portion of the file system, the working version including at least a first working item originating from the first item, the first working item initially being located at a second location, the second location being identifiable by the first location information; (see Verma col. 16, lines 39-44: 1st and 2nd operational states (i.e. working item states) for same file) and
- c) using information in the comparison file and about the working version to detect if at least one of two operations were performed on the working version, the operations including changing the first location information for the first working item, and editing a content of the first working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12: file management operation(s) (i.e. editing) performed on file indicated by file handle (i.e. working item))

Regarding Claims 31, 105 (Original), Verma discloses a method for managing files (see Verma col. 8, lines 54-61; col. 8, lines 20-25: file system management operations), the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2143

- a) mapping information about a file system to a comparison file, the information identifying at least a first item in the file system located at a first location, the first location being identifiable by a first location information; (see Verma col. 9, lines 10-17: file handler (i.e. working item) for file system management operations)
- b) making a working version of a portion of the file system, the working version including at least a first working item originating from the first item, the first working item initially being located at a second location, the second location being identifiable by the first location information; (see Verma col. 16, lines 39-44: 1st and 2nd operational states (i.e. working item states) for same file) and
- c) using information in the comparison file and about the working version to determine if a compound operation was performed on the first working item, the compound operation including at least two successive operations from a set of operations that consist of changing the first location information for the first working item, making a first working copy from the first working item, and editing a content of the first working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 16, lines 39-44; col. 8, lines 26-28: at least two (i.e. compound) read/write (i.e. copy, edit) operations performed and file system update completed)

Regarding Claims 32, 106 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 31, 105, further comprising causing the portion of the file system to incorporate changes made by operations performed on the working version so that the first

Art Unit: 2143

item matches the first working item. (see Verma col. 8, lines 26-28: read/write (i.e. edit) operation completed or committed within actual file (i.e. actual file contents matches working item))

Regarding Claims 33, 107 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 31, 105, wherein for one of the at least two compound operations being making a first working copy from the first working item, the method further includes determining if a selected working item in the working version was once copied from the first working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 8, lines 26-28: read/write (i.e. copy) operation performed and completed)

34- 75 (Cancelled)

Regarding Claim 87 (Original), Verma discloses a computer readable medium carrying instructions for managing files (see Verma col. 8, lines 54-61; col. 8, lines 20-25: file management operations) on different computers, the instructions including instructions for performing the steps of:

- a) mapping information about a file system to a comparison file making a working version of a portion of the file system; (see Verma col. 9, lines 10-17: : file handler (i.e. comparison file or working version) for file system management operations)
- b) using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if a first working item in the working version was

Art Unit: 2143

once copied from a second working item in the working version. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12: 1st and 2nd operational states (i.e. working item states) for same file)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17 - 20, 22, 23, 26 - 30, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 91 - 94, 96 - 98, 100 - 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verma in view of Wolff (US Patent No. 6,101,508).

Regarding Claims 4, 29, 79, 103 (Original), Verma discloses wherein making a working version of a portion of the file system in the first working item of the comparison file. (see Verma col. 2, lines 33-35: file management operations) Verma does not specifically disclose a creation time as part of the working file system management item. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 3, 25, 78, 99, wherein includes recording a creation time. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management) information specifically

Art Unit: 2143

includes a creation time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing a creation time parameter as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34: "*... an improved system and method for distributed processing over a network ... a system would remove the bottlenecks and disadvantages associated with current distributed networks ... allow the distribution of processes to function and be managed in a cross platform environment ...*")

Regarding Claims 5, 80 (Original), Verma discloses wherein using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if the first working item is located at a third location identifiable by a second location information includes locating the first working item in the working version. (see Verma col. 2, lines 33-35; col. 16, lines 33-35: file system management operations) Verma does not specifically disclose a creation time as part of the working file system management item. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 3, 78, wherein using a creation time. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management) information specifically a creation time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file management item containing

Art Unit: 2143

a creation time parameter as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claims 7, 82 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 6, 81, further including using the creation time of the first working item to determine that the first working item has been deleted from the working version. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 28, lines 14-20: deletion operation performed and file system update completed)

Regarding Claims 8, 83 (Original), Verma discloses wherein making a working version of a portion of the file system in the comparison file. (see Verma col. 2, lines 33-35: file management operations) Verma does not specifically disclose a modification time parameter as part of the working file management item.

However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 4, 79, wherein includes recording a modification time. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management) information specifically a modification time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file management item containing a modification time parameter as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding Claims 10, 85 (Original), Verma discloses wherein further comprising determining if the first working item was edited subsequent to making the working version of the first working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12: read/write (i.e. edit) operation performed) Verma does not disclose a modification time parameter. However, Wolff disclose the method of claims 8, 83, wherein a modification time. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management) information specifically a modification time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing a modification time parameter as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claims 11, 86 (Original), Verma does not disclose a modification time parameter. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 10, 85, further comprising determining if a subsequent modification time of the first working item is different than the recorded modification time for the first working item. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28; col. 75, lines 6-10: directory (file management) information specifically a modification time, comparison of time parameters)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item

Art Unit: 2143

containing a modification time parameter as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claims 17, 91 (Original), Verma discloses wherein making a working version in the comparison file for the second working item. (see Verma col. 2, lines 33-35: file management operations) Verma does not specifically disclose creation and modification time parameters as part of the working file system management item. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 14, 89, wherein includes recording both a creation time and a modification time. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management) information specifically a creation and a modification time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing creation and modification time parameters as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claims 18, 92 (Original), Verma discloses wherein using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if a first working item in the working version was once copied from a second

Art Unit: 2143

working item in the working version. (see Verma col. 2, lines 33-35; col. 16, lines 33-35; col. 11, lines 10-12: file system management operations (i.e. copy))

Verma does not specifically disclose creation and modification time parameters as part of the working file system management item. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 17, 91, wherein includes identifying a creation time and a modification time for the first working item. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management:) information specifically a creation and a modification time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing creation and modification time parameters as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claims 19, 93 (Original), Verma discloses wherein using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if a first working item in the working version was once copied from a second working item in the working version. (see Verma col. 2, lines 33-35; col. 16, lines 33-35: file management operations, determination of copy operation performed) Verma does not specifically disclose a comparison of creation and modification time parameters. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 18, 92, wherein detecting that the modification time of the first working item is before the

Art Unit: 2143

creation time of the first working item. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28; col. 75, lines 6-10: directory (file management) information specifically a creation and a modification time, comparison of creation times)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing creation and modification time parameters as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claims 20, 94 (Original), Verma discloses wherein using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if a first working item in the working version was once copied from a second working item in the working version (see Verma col. 9, lines 10-17; col. 11, lines 10-12: file handler (i.e. working item) for file system management operations, read/write (i.e. copy) operation performed) Verma does not disclose modification time parameters and comparison of time parameters. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 19, 93, wherein includes matching the modification time of the first working item with the modification time of the second working item. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28; col. 75, lines 6-10: directory (file management) information specifically a creation and a modification time, comparison of creation times)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2143

invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file management item containing a modification time parameter and a comparison of modification times as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claims 22, 96 (Original), Verma discloses wherein further comprising determining that the first working item is new. (see Verma col. 2, lines 33-35; col. 11, lines 10-12: creation (i.e. new) file system management operation performed) Verma does not specifically disclose a comparison of creation times. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 12, 87, wherein if a creation time is different than a creation time of all of the items identified by the comparison file and if the modification time for the first working item is greater than or equal to creation time for the first working item. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28; col. 75, lines 6-10: directory (file management) information specifically a creation and a modification time, comparison of creation times)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing creation and modification time parameters and comparison of time parameters as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding Claims 23, 97 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 22, 96, further comprising causing the portion of the file system to include the first working item after determining the first working item is new. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 8, lines 26-28: creation (i.e. new) operation performed and completed)

Regarding Claims 26, 100 (Original), Verma discloses wherein making a working version of a portion of the file system for the first working item in the comparison file, (see Verma col. 9, lines 10-17: file handler (i.e. working item) for file system management operations) Verma does not specifically disclose a modification time. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 25, 99, wherein the initial modification time recording a last instance when the first working item was either edited or created. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management) information specifically a modification time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing a modification time parameter as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding Claims 27, 101 (Original), Verma discloses wherein detecting the operation of editing the content of the first working item (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12: read/write (i.e. edit) operation performed) Verma does not specifically disclose a modification time. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 26, 100, wherein includes subsequently determining if the initial modification time was changed. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management) information specifically a modification time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing a modification time parameter as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claims 28, 102 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claims 27, 101, further comprising causing the first item of the file system to include the edited content of the first working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 8, lines 26-28: completion of a read/write (i.e. edit) operation, contents of actual file updated)

Regarding Claims 30, 104 (Original), Verma discloses wherein using information in the comparison file and about the working version to detect if at least one of two operations were performed on the working version includes

Art Unit: 2143

locating the first working item in the working version. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12; col. 8, lines 26-28: one or more file system management operations performed and file system update completed) Verma does not specifically disclose a creation time parameter as part of the working file system management item. However, Wolff discloses the method of claims 29, 103, wherein using the creation time. (see Wolff col. 23, lines 20-30; col. 69, lines 21-28: directory (file management) information specifically a creation time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Verma to utilize a file system management item containing a creation time parameter as taught by Wolff. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Wolff in order to optimize and improve distributed processing of data within a network environment. (see Wolff col. 2, lines 28-34)

Regarding Claim 98 (Original), Verma discloses the method of claim 12, wherein using information in the comparison file and about the working version to subsequently determine if a first working item in the working version was once copied from a second working item in the working version includes comparing a content of the first working item to a content of the second working item. (see Verma col. 11, lines 10-12: determination of edited (i.e. copied, changed contents) of file information via file handle (i.e. working item))

Art Unit: 2143

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung H Shin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KHS

Kyung H Shin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

KHS
Feb 27, 2005

William C. Vaughn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143
William C. Vaughn, Jr.